



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/920,801	08/03/2001	Taher Elgamal	06975-193002	8214
26171	7590	02/08/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			KLIMACH, PAULA W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2135	

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/920,801	Applicant(s) ELGAMAL ET AL.	
	Examiner Paula W. Klimach	Art Unit 2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 31-34, 36-43 and 45-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 31-34, 36-43 and 45-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This office action is in response to amendment filed on 11/14/2005. The applicant amended claims 31, 36, 38, 40, 45, and 47. The amendment filed on 11/14/2005 have been entered and made of record. Therefore, presently pending claims are 31-34, 36-43, and 45-48.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/14/2005 have been fully considered the new grounds of rejection are found below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 31, 36-40, and 45-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drews (6,647,494 B1) and further in view of Perona et al (6,671,809).

In reference to claims 31 and 40 Drew discloses a system and method for checking authorization of remote configuration operations (title). The system includes accessing a manifest that corresponds to the policy file in this application. The manifest includes an attribute portion (configurable parameters) configured to store one or more policy attributes and a value portion having one or more attribute values (column 4 lines 17-21), each attribute value

Art Unit: 2135

corresponding to a policy attribute and a digital certificate including at least one digital signature portion (column 4 line 56 to column 5 line 45); determining whether the policy file is unaltered based on the signature portion of the policy file (column 5 lines 49-53); retrieving at least one of the attributes and, for each retrieved attribute, an attribute value corresponding to the attribute from the policy file, manifest, (Fig. 7).

However Drews does not disclose expressly disclose determining whether an application program may use a function capable of being performed by the application program and thus determining whether a function represented by a retrieved attribute is permitted to be accessed by the application program; and permitting the application program to access the function conditioned upon a determination that the policy file is unaltered.

Perona discloses determining whether an application program may use a function capable of being performed by the application program and thus determining whether a function represented by a retrieved attribute is permitted to be accessed by the application program (column 6 lines 15-23); and permitting the application program to access the function conditioned upon a determination that the policy file is unaltered (column 6 lines 24-36).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the integrity check for new upgrades, configurations, as in the system of Perona in the system of Drews. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would enable upgrades to be performed in a manner that ensures that only components that are licensed or otherwise approved for use with one another may be utilized in combination (Perona column 3 lines 14-19).

In reference to claims 38 and 47, wherein and each of the attribute values is one of a string, an integer number, and a truth expression (Fig. 4).

In reference to claims 39 and 48, wherein the truth expression is one of a true flag, a false flag, and a conditional flag (part 44 Fig. 1).

In reference to claims 36 and 45 wherein the signature portion applies to the attribution portion and the value portion of the policy file; determining whether the policy file is unaltered comprises determining whether the attribute portion and the value portion are unaltered based on the signature portion (Fig. 4).

In reference to claims 37 and 46 wherein the signature portion applies to the policy file, manifest (column 4 lines 38-48).

Claims 32-34 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drews in view of Perona et al as applied to claims 31 and 40 above, and further in view of Anderl et al (WO 87/07063).

In reference to claims 32 and 41 Drews and Perona do not expressly disclose the policy file comprising a JAVA archive file.

Anderl discloses the storage of multiple files on a smart card (page 2 lines 19-29). JAR files are Java class files. A smart card can contain multiple files as evidenced by Anderl; therefore can contain JAR files. The JAR files may contain digital signatures which are used for security as the files in Anderl that are credentials used for security.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to keep multiple files as in the file of Anderl in the system of Drews. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the amount of files stored

Art Unit: 2135

in a smart card is only limited by the amount of memory made available in the smart card. In addition the policy of Drews can be divided into sub domain and files are a convenient method of organizing data.

In reference to claims 33-34 and 42-43, wherein the policy file comprises multiple component files, at least one of the component files storing some of the attribute portions and attribute values.

Although Drews and Perona do not disclose the policy being stored in multiple files

Anderl discloses the storage of multiple files on a smart card (page 2 lines 19-29).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to keep multiple files as in the file of Anderl in the system of Drews. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the amount of files stored in a smart card is only limited by the amount of memory made available in the smart card. In addition the policy of Drews can be divided into sub domain and files are a convenient method of organizing data.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2135


will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paula W. Klimach whose telephone number is (571) 272-3854. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Thr 9:30 a.m to 5:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PWK
Wednesday, February 01, 2006


KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100